

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 17 and 33 have been amended. These amendments are supported by specification as filed, for example in paragraphs 0020, 0023, 0029, 0030 and Figure 3. Thus, no new matter is added.

All of the presently pending claims are patentable over Begeja et al. (US PGPUB 2003/0030752). Begeja describes a multimedia delivery service that records video segments, analyzes them and classifies them. The classification is used to search content based on requested criteria, and the selected segments are then stitched together and streamed to the user from a video server. Begeja ¶¶ 0022-0026. However, Begeja neither teaches nor suggests receiving user input, the user input specifying a set of two or more of the plurality of VOD clips and their user defined sequencing order, as presently claimed.

The predetermined order taught in Begeja, such as reverse chronological order are not user defined and a user can just select one of these predetermined orders rather than define his own ordering, as presently claimed. Begeja ¶ 0065. Nowhere does Begeja provide for user input to specify user defined sequence ordering of selected VOD clips. Allowing user to select a predefined ordering, such as, reverse chronological order should not be confused with allowing users to define their own sequencing order for the selected VOD clips. Hence, all the present claims are patentable over Begeja.

Adding the teachings of Shimomura et al. US Patent 6,526,580, to those of Begeja does not alter the conclusions set forth above. Shimomura is cited for purportedly describing a method of traversing a decision tree. Even if true, and assuming such teachings were added to those of Begeja, this does not alter the above conclusions regarding the patentability of the present claims. There is no mention of user specifying the user defined sequencing order of selected VOD clips. Consequently, all the present claims are patentable over this combination of references.

Adding the teachings of Mitchell US PG PUB 2002/0162120, to those of Begeja does not alter the conclusions set forth above. Mitchell is cited for describing a system that transmits metadata using URLs. Even if true, and assuming such teachings were added to those of Begeja, this does not alter the above conclusions regarding the patentability of the present claims. There is no mention of user specifying the user defined sequencing order of selected VOD clips. Consequently, all the present claims are patentable over this combination of references.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with this communication, please charge our deposit account 19-3140

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Dated: June 26, 2008

/Tarek N. Fahmi/

Tarek N. Fahmi
Reg. No. 41,402

PO Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
415/ 882-5023